

**WOODSTOCK PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2012, 7:30 P.M.
WOODSTOCK TOWN HALL, MEETING ROOM 1**

MINUTES

I. MONTHLY MEETING

- a. Call to Order – Meeting was called to order by Chair Gordon at 7:30 p.m.
- b. Roll Call – Dave Fortin, Jeff Gordon, Delia Fey, Fred Rich, Syd Blodget, Lynn White, Dexter Young, Dorothy Durst, Gail Dickinson (7:46)
Absent: Joseph Adiletta, Ken Goldsmith, John Anastasi, Travis Serrine
A quorum is noted for the record by Chair Gordon.

II. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- Chairman Gordon welcomes PZC newest member, Lynn White, who was appointed by the Board of Selectman to serve as an alternate.
- Reminder: February 2, 2012 at 7:00, annual attorney training session and then afterwards, a scheduled subcommittee meeting.
- Chair Gordon makes a request for a motion to move some of the items up to the top of the agenda to accommodate the public that is waiting to be heard.

**MOTION BY DURST TO MOVE ITEM VIII. C UNDER UNFINISHED BUSINESS, WOODSTOCK ACADEMY STUDENT HOUSING ISSUE, DOWN TO X IN THE PLACE OF ZEO REPORT. SECONDED BY WHITE.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

III. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS – None

IV. DESIGNATION OF ALTERNATES - Lynne White is seated

V. MINUTES

Meeting Minutes – December 15, 2011

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF 12/15/2011 BY FORTIN, SECONDED BY RICH.

Chair Gordon would like to make a correction on page 7, on the bottom about 5 New Sweden Road. The 4th sentence up begins, "Mr. DeCostanzo presents two letters." Just for clarification it should read: Mr. DeCostanzo presents two unsigned letters.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. NON RESIDENTIAL ZONING PERMITS

a. P.A.W.S. – Cat shelter at 240 Rte 171

Fey explain that a letter was sent last month with questions about the business and their response was received and dated December 9, 2011. Lydia Reed (PAWS), Kathy Langer (Windy Acres) and Joanne Peterson (owner of building) are present to answer any questions. The reason for their presence is due to the PZC's request for

further information about the business so it could be determined what type of permit would be required. NDDH and NECCOG representatives, along with town and Windham County Animal Control Officers have visited the site. They have made recommendations for minor changes that have been implemented or in the process of being. PZC is requesting documentation from these visits. The can and bottle drive is what they are using to collect funds to care for the cats. There are additional forms that need to be submitted to the state. Durst would like to clarify the issues for the record:

- If there are cans and bottles stored on site, will they attract rodents and critters? Are they being stored in a secure area? This is PZC's task to protect the health and public safety of the residents. Not sure this has been addressed yet.
- How to dispose of the waste that is created by these cats may not have been adequately addressed.

In response, Lydia Reed states that the can and bottle drive is no longer being handled at this location and they are doing this work at their homes on a daily basis and bringing to the recycling centers more often. They have a person actually handling this job. The animal waste is being disposed of properly. They are using a 100% biodegradable litter that is made of corn. They usually transport to their private residence for disposal in the toilet, since the septic system at home is large enough to handle this. It is double bagged, then put in a third bag and sealed in a latching lid garbage can.

The cat shelter is not similar to what was contained in the building previously so the Commission must decide if this should have a zoning permit, change of business or special permit. **(Gail Dickinson is present at 7:46 p.m.)** Commission is discussing whether this change of use could actually fit in any categories as defined in the regulations. Ms. Reed explains that the cat shelter just happened without planning based on the needs in the community. They have no intentions of continuing this operation for any significant length of time. Being a non-profit operation, they really did not think it would be classified as a business but more of a rescue group. They have found that there is a tremendous need for this service in the community. They have been turning people away to try and downsize and keep control.

After discussion and explanation of the use and careful consideration to the regulations, PZC has decided a change of use would be acceptable and they have determined that this use could be classified as a service establishment. Owner will receive the assistance of the ZEO to move forward in completing the proper paperwork for this permit.

b. 7 Pole Bridge Road – Paramount Glassworks

Ms. Fey has researched the property and the old assessor's card from 1980 revealed that there was a machine shop at this property in 1956. She could not find any other reference to a business but she did visit the site and it does not appear to be a residential garage. It is very tall with large garage doors. What is left of the previous use is a lift for vehicles and two compressors that would have powered that lift. These are not items that people would normally have in a garage for personal use. There are

also several heavy duty electrical outlets that would not normally be used for residential use.

Kenny Plouf and Ranier Landry are present on behalf of the business. PZC requests detail on the type of business. As explained by Mr. Plouf, this will be a machine shop to work on precision optics to support the industry. Type of work will be grinding lenses, mainly water based with diamond tooling. No polishing. Coolant is 100% biodegradable. It is not critical for any signs to be installed. No further questions or comments from PZC or public.

**MOTION BY DICKINSON TO APPROVE BUSINESS PERMIT FOR
PARAMOUNT GLASSWORKS, SECONDED BY FORTIN. MOTION
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VII. PUBLIC HEARING - TO COMMENCE AT 8:00 P.M.

#SP579-08-09 Woodstock Academy, Bentley Athletic Field Expansion – Modification to Special Permit (Changes as required by USDA and scoreboard relocation).

Dave Fortin reminds Commission that he is recused from participating, as he stated in his letter that was read for the record at the November meeting. Lynn White also recuses herself from participating. Chair Gordon notes that there is still a quorum to continue this business. Attorney Cotnoir, Mr. Eaton (CME) and Mr. Campbell are all present. The public hearing was left open to address the following items:

- The plans to be submitted must be signed off and sealed by a professional engineer.
- Traffic patterns and parking in areas not designated for parking because the new plan calls for a decrease in spaces. Some revisions were requested to address the concerns from this change.

Mr. Eaton, P.E., from CME, provides details on the modifications based on last month's discussion. Dimensional drawings are provided. The applicant has received permission to utilize 75 parking spaces from the town hall during major sporting events and any other shortfalls in parking could be addressed by bussing spectators in from Woodstock Academy campus. The other item was the bonding. The revisions they are requesting do not affect E&S bond and he recommends the bond not be reduced due to the fact that the site stabilization and E&S controls on the site are temporary and they will require maintenance throughout construction. Once any permanent E&S controls are installed, that would be an appropriate time to reduce the bond. Plan shows a split rail fence. The application does not show minimum 150' frontage in error. It was corrected on the record that when the original permit was approved, this was an issue and the lots were combined to correct the problem. These revisions do not have to go before Army Corp of Engineers or IWWA because they are not proposing changes in the wetlands or creating any additional disturbance and actually reducing it. Two handicapped parking spaces for football field and four are shown for the baseball field. Blodgett references last meeting minutes and the fact that a traffic study was being requested. Attorney Cotnoir confirms this as being accurate. However, Mr. Eaton has reviewed the initial traffic study completed, which was very detailed, and it is noted that there are about 390 parking spaces in this area and there will be a loss of 35. Those percentages are small and Mr. Eaton has

therefore submitted his opinion that it is not going to be a substantial impact. Additionally noted that there is a pre-existing permit that allows the academy to use the additional parking spaces and to bus people in which will provide access to over 70 spaces. The coversheet submitted has the engineer's stamp. Revision clouds on plans show the changes. No comments from public or PZC.

MOTION BY YOUNG TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING ON #SP579-08-09, SECONDED BY DICKINSON. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. **#SP579-08-09** Woodstock Academy, Bentley Athletic Field Expansion – Modification to Special Permit (Changes as required by USDA and scoreboard relocation).

MOTION BY DICKINSON TO APPROVE #SP579-08-09, SECONDED BY RICH.

The following are the requested waivers (Article IV, Section 4, B)

- On-site sewage disposal (Article IV, Section 4 B. 2)
- Sewer service, WPCA (Article IV, Section 4 B. 3)
- Water service/water supply (Article IV, Section 4 B. 4)
- Subdivision approval (Article IV, Section 4 B. 6)
- Architectural elevations (Article IV, Section 4 B. 9)
- Traffic report (Article IV, Section 4 B. 10)

MOTION BY DURST TO AMEND DICKINSON'S MOTION TO APPROVE AND WAIVE THE ABOVE ITEMS, SECONDED BY YOUNG.

It is agreed that the application does meet all of the 11 Special Permit criteria:

1. Is in compliance with the zoning regulations of the Town of Woodstock;
2. All proposed Special Permits conform with the Plan of Conservation and Development and the Plan of Open Space and Conservation.
3. Does not adversely impact existing traffic conditions, including a finding that streets serving the proposed use or activity are adequate to carry any additional traffic generated by the use or activity, and that no traffic safety problem (e.g., poor sight line) will be caused or significantly aggravated by the use or activity.
4. Will generate minimal off-site impacts, including but not limited to adverse impacts on property values and the reasonable use, enjoyment and development of properties in the surrounding neighborhood.
5. Includes adequate landscape and buffering treatments.
6. Will not generate additional storm water runoff so as to adversely affect downstream drainage systems, wetlands, watercourses or structures.
7. Will not adversely affect ground or surface waters nor endanger future drinking water supplies.
8. Will have adequate systems for sewage disposal and water service.
9. Will have an acceptable erosion and sedimentation control plan.
10. Will provide unhindered emergency vehicle access.
11. Will not adversely affect the health and safety of residents or workers.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. **#06-11-12** Chamberlin Family Land Trust, Dewing School House Road – Request to extend existing common driveway

According to Ms. Fey, the highway foreman, John Navarro, has reviewed the plans and application and discussed it with the engineer, Mark Peterson, and any issues have been resolved. Attorney Beth Critton of Goodwin and Shipman, colleague of Tim Hollister, is present on behalf of the applicant, Dan & Sharon Chamberlin. Mark Peterson, P.E. of Gardner and Peterson is also present on their behalf. The application is for the extension or paving of the non-public portion of an existing common driveway. The property owners/applicant would like to use their lot as a building lot for only one house. Based on research, it appears that Dewing School House Road is an abandoned road. The plan is to use the existing road way but to pave it. The primary regulation that is applicable is Article XI, Section 1.a.3 which says that a lot must have at least 25 feet frontage on an approved common driveway out-letting to an approved town road or state highway. There has been some difference in opinion regarding the status of Dewing School House Road and their belief that it was an existing approved town road, and they have withdrawn that claim since the evidence does not support it. Although this is not a subdivision application, their request is made with reference to and respect for these subdivision regulations which seem to favor the use of a common driveway. Back on July 21st, they came before PZC seeking guidance on the proper direction for their request and PZC did ask for the following:

- Delineated inland wetlands;
- Take a close look at whether there was a potential for no more than five users for the proposed extended common driveway;
- To submit a plan that was acceptable to the fire department;
- to provide a statement regarding written access.

The wetlands were delineated and the IWWA did approve their request at the December 5, 2011 meeting. Fire marshal had expressed concern for safety and responsibility for keeping the driveway plowed from the end of the current pavement to the future lot and structure and any other maintenance responsibilities. Applicant agrees to a condition of approval on this maintenance concern.

Mark Peterson, P.E. is present to go over the details of the plan. He confirms he has had discussions with Mr. Navarro both on the phone and through e-mail and his comments were regarding run-off and Mr. Navarro is satisfied with the plan. Gravel driveway is proposed off of the gravel turn-around. Every 300 feet a by-pass area is proposed. The driveway extension plan (slopes, drainage and lots to be served) was explained to PZC by Mr. Peterson. Wetland approval was given and a copy is in the file. Sheet flow goes from south to the north and drains towards the turnaround area on Dewing Schoolhouse Road and would not appear to affect the other properties. PZC has some concern regarding the legal issues for the properties that this road crosses. Attorney Critton quotes CGS 13a-55 regarding this issue: *“Property owners bounding a discontinued or abandoned highway, or a highway any portion of which has been discontinued or abandoned, shall have a right-of-way for all purposes for which a public highway may be now or hereafter used over such discontinued or abandoned highway to the nearest or most accessible highway, provided such right-of-way has not been acquired in conjunction with a limited access highway.”*

Attorney Critton also has case law, a federal court 2009 decision, to support her client's claims and they are provided for the record. She also quotes case law regarding the PZC's limited jurisdiction with respect to easement issues which basically states local planning & zoning commissions are not appropriate bodies to make decisions about the validity of private issues of easements. This case law is provided for the record.

Daniel Chamberlin has confirmed that his intention is to have only one building lot. There are questions about future development and potential subdivision in the future. Usual a common driveway comes in off a town road into a piece of property for the use of five people and is part of a subdivision application. This is not the case here. There appears to be some ambiguity as to whether this road is discontinued or abandoned. Attorney Critton states that it was her recommendation to file to the town in this manner based on her interpretation of the regulations. People do have a right to develop their land and CT policy and law does not favor completely land-locking someone. The regulations contemplate a variety of ways that someone can get to a one family lot; frontage requirements on an approved town road, state highway, private road or at least 25 feet on an approved common driveway out-letting to an approved town road or state highway. Letter dated December 7, 2011 from Attorney Hollister does talk about issues that were raised by other property owners and it is noted that they would be handled privately since this would not be the purview of the PZC based on state statutes. PZC not sure if this application can actually be considered a common driveway and if not, Attorney Critton would like the record clear as to what options would actually be available to her clients to have access to their property. How many property owners on the abandoned or discontinued road might ever need access to an extension of Dewing Schoolhouse Road? If the Commission grants this extension, a homeowner's association may be required to protect the other property owners on the road. There is discussion on what the rights of the abutting property owners might be, whether PZC can grant this without their permission and if the regulations require proof of easements. Also, PZC questions if by not providing access, would it be considered a taking of the land, or if approving access would actually be considered a taking of the abutting property owners' land. Attorney Critton would like to address these concerns after she has an opportunity to do a little more research. It was decided that PZC should consult with town attorney to answer these legal questions. PZC is interested in reviewing all possible alternatives for this request in an effort to consider statutory concerns along with their responsibility to protect the community and setting a precedent. It is not clear whether the owner has a right to improve this road.

Julie Blake, resident of the town, as well as an attorney representing the Esposito's, abutting property owners, makes the following points:

- There is a claim that the applicant is also the owner of the lot and this is being disputed by the Esposito's;
- The claim that the property reverts back to the center of the road, the statute referred to was enacted in 1959. There is a CT appellate court case from 1990 which states that statute is not retroactive and any roads designated before 1959 do not contain right-of-way. In this case, the road was discontinued in 1829. Their claim is that statute would not apply. No basis whatsoever for claiming a right-of-way down this property.

- History of this area needs to be explored. Recommends a title search. She believes the property may have been subdivided by the Chamberlin's in this manner specifically to keep that parcel as a hunting tract of land and they created their own hardship.
- She does not believe PZC has the ability to consider this proposal because they do not have standing. A Supreme Court decision that is provided for the record states four elements must be satisfied for an applicant to apply for a special permit and the Esposito's believe this has not been met. 1. They would need control of the property. 2. Possession or future possession of the property. 3. A proposal that is consistent with their interest in the property. 4. When standing is considered, the interest of the other property owners must be considered.

Attorney Blake claims there were negotiations back in 2006 and 2007 that broke down between the parties. At that point in time, there was an easement proposed by the Chamberlin trust and they admitted at that point that they do not have a right-of-way that exists right now. She urges PZC to not act on the application and consult town counsel. A discontinued road is a formal designation. Her appellate court documentation rules on this same issue and the court said, no, because the road was discontinued prior to the statute. The current landowners of this road are under no obligation to grant passage over that road. Gail Dickinson reads Section 13a 55, for the record, and reiterates that it is not clear on whether this road can be improved.

In response to PZC questions, Attorney Blake is questioned on her research from 2006 and 2007 when she was representing the surrounding landowners. She states the road was discontinued on October 5, 1829. The statute was enacted in 1959.

Julie Drouin - Abutting property owner agrees that the Commission should explore all the options. She confirms the road is accessible and people do walk, hike and ride horses on the road but it is very wet and swampy and narrow at one point. She is concerned with losing some of her property if this road were widened.

Aino Kardestunger – Abutting property owner states that when she bought her land, she actually asked Mr. Chamberlin why he was creating this landlocked piece for himself and he said that it would be used for hunting and he didn't intend on building there.

Daniel Chamberlin – Applicant. States an A-2 survey was done in the 1960's and that all the surveying that has been done acknowledges the right-of-way and the pins are not in the center of the road but on the edge of the right-of-way. So there is an assumption that the property goes to the center of the road.

John Day – Abutting property owner, along with his wife, own the property to the north of Dewing School House Rd. This issue has been going on since April or May of 2011, and why was he not notified earlier? He only learned of this about five days ago. He is a little surprised that plans were being made to bring equipment in to widen the supposed right-of-way that would involve water coming onto his property without

anyone notifying him. His concerns have to do with the widening of the road causing run-off in an already very wet area.

Attorney Critton request that the Commission not deny the application, but table, to allow time for them to respond to the legal issues.

MOTION BY RICH, SECONDED BY YOUNG TO TABLE TO FEBRUARY 16, 2012 MEETING TO ALLOW TIME TO GET INFORMATION FROM OUR ATTORNEY. 65 day deadline for the decision without extension is Feb 18, 2012. Extensions could push the decision into April.

Questions for the Town Attorney:

1. What is the status of a right-of-way on abandoned or discontinued roads that achieved that status prior to the statute that allows right-of-way across abandoned and discontinued roads and is that a right to construction on that road or improvement under CGS?

2. What is the difference between a right-of-way over a discontinued or abandoned road, and how that was different from a right-of-way across the property that has frontage to get to the rear lot?

3. Once they have attorney's opinion about the legal question, they also need his guidance on how to proceed on how the regulations will allow them to give a permit for a common drive when it's not an option.

4. If the attorney determines that these landowners do have the right of access, does the commission have the ability to require single family driveway or common driveway or full blown town road, private road?

5. If these owners do have the right to cross the property and the commission has the ability to require a full blown town road then who has to build it, the town or the applicant?

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY YOUNG TO EXTEND BUSINESS AFTER 10:00 P.M. SECONDED BY FORTIN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

- a. **#603-11-12** Patricia Brown – Modification of re-subdivision for boundary line adjustment.

Delia Fey explains her letter of December 28, 2011 to Ms. Brown regarding the requirements of submitting this application. The letter to Ms. Fey received in response from John Guskowski on behalf of Ms. Brown dated January 5, 2012 disputes Ms. Fey's opinion since being a simple lot line adjustment does not trigger the definition of re-subdivision as found in the CT General Statutes. In response to Mr. Guskowski's letter, Ms. Fey has since clarified and withdraws her request to the applicant for additional information. This modification is to a re-subdivision dated 09-01-2005 and does not create a new lot and therefore would not require a public hearing.

Donald and Patricia Brown are present to answer any questions. Ms. Brown states that this modification, lot line adjustment, will allow them access to their wood lot which is the size of a tractor and nothing more. NDDH has approved their request and documentation of said approval was received for the record.

**MOTION TO APPROVE #603-11-12 BY RICH, SECONDED BY FORTIN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

b. **#SP604-12-12** Paul & Stephanie Charrette, Tractors 2 Trimmers – 1072 Route 171 – business expansion

Property owners are not present. PZC's role this evening is to accept the application and schedule a public hearing. Fey explains that this business was operating as a home occupation. A complaint was received and it was found that they were operating beyond the limits of this home occupation.

MOTION BY RICH TO SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING ON #SP604-12-12 FOR FEBRUARY 16, 2012, SECONDED BY LYNN WHITE.

c. **#Senexet Village Subdivision (#499-04-09)** Open Space Lot #17 – Review and approve a report on the acquisition of open space land pursuant to CGS 8-24

PZC has the opportunity to issue a report to the BOS regarding this acquisition. A town meeting will then be scheduled. Ms. Fey states she has handed out the information concerning this and has walked the open space when there was a request to reduce the bond. She found at that time that there was an erosion problem that Mr. Porter has since addressed. There are no additional issues that Ms. Fey is aware of. Soccer field is ready. There are basketball hoops, parking area and a trail.

**MOTION BY RICH, SECONDED BY DICKINSON FOR PZC TO
ISSUE A FAVORABLE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

X. CONTINUED UNFINISHED BUSINESS (moved in agenda order)

c. **#SP579-08-09m** Woodstock Academy Student Housing issue – Boarding house at 599 Route 169

Richard Baron, fire marshal has issued a report dated January 5, 2012 that states the maximum student occupant load for the building would be 15 and there are other requirements of smoke and heat detectors, fire alarms, required lighting, outside stairs going to the second floor. There is a small apartment and there needs to be a door installed so the house parent would be separated.

Terry Bellman, building official has also provided a letter which states that currently the building code only allows a maximum of six students on the first floor of the building, because the apartment on the second floor has a tenant which constitutes a mixed use and therefore requires fire separation. Once the tenant vacates the premises, there will be modifications required to meet the building code and then additional students, a maximum of 15 for the entire building, will be allowed at that time. Zoning regulations do not contain a definition for student housing and there isn't really a category for this type of permit. Fortin would like to discuss this at the subcommittee meeting. This

use may not be permitted under PZC regulations. There is discussion on how this student housing might fit it into the regulations and how to move forward in a way that makes sense. It is recommended that the Woodstock Academy propose a text amendment.

Joseph Campbell of Woodstock Academy and Attorney Cotnoir are present to answer questions. Attorney Cotnoir is working with WA to create this text amendment and it will be submitted at the next regular meeting. It was decided that a Notice of Violation, which is the first step in the process, should be issued to Woodstock Academy letting them know that there is a violation. The time frame between a Notice of Violation and the next step in the process should allow WA enough time to get this text amendment and a subsequent application submitted for consideration. Mr. Campbell stated for the record that there are six students living at this address currently. There are nine new boarding students expected for the new semester, but they will be living with local families. The third house that was purchased for student use by WA is currently empty, according to Campbell, and will remain that way until this is resolved.

XI. ZEO REPORT

- 52 Loyola Road – Town attorney is working on moving forward with violation
- 599 Route 169 – already discussed
- Additional zoning violations were found recently and Fey will present at the next meeting once she researches the facts

(Noted for the record that Lynn White has left the meeting at 10:50 p.m.)

- 36 Walker Lane – 2004 permit was issued for storage/boathouse. No holding tank was allowed. A cottage/house was actually constructed. A Notice of Violation letter was sent out. NDDH was also notified and they have not approved the work either.
- Klansek – Attorney DeCrescenzo will address at the training meeting.

XII. BUDGET REVIEW AND BILLS

No bills to sign off on.

Year to date on legal bills - \$3,000 has been paid for both ZEO and PZC.

PZC needs to submit new budget 2012/2013 to BOF and BOS. There is discussion on how PZC will want to spend for the next fiscal year and how to properly allocate funds. It was decided to leave the budget as is and submit exactly the same as last year.

MOTION BY DURST, SECONDED BY RICH TO SUBMIT THE SAME BUDGET AS LAST YEAR. 0% INCREASE. Letter to be sent by Chair Gordon. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- XIII. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS – none**
- XIV. BYLAWS**
MOTION BY DICKINSON TO TABLE BYLAWS, SECONDED BY RICH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- XV. CORRESPONDENCE**
Copy of letter to Terry Bellman from Chair Gordon regarding 5 New Sweden Road
- XVI. PROPOSED ZONING VIOLATION FINING ORDINANCE**
This proposal was submitted to the BOS. They requested further information on the appeal process, hearing officers, etc. This wording is already contained in an existing ordinance that went into effect for IWWA in the 1990's. Chair Gordon will bring this to BOS attention for clarification.
- XVII. MINUTES OF OTHER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**
a. Zoning Board of Appeals - December 27, 2011
- XVIII. OTHER**
- XIX. ADJOURNMENT**
MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 11:11 P.M. BY YOUNG, SECONDED BY RICH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tina M. Lajoie, Clerk
Planning & Zoning Commission

DISCLAIMER:

These minutes have not yet been approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission. Please refer to next month's minutes for approval/amendments. Please note that the audio recording is the legal record of the meeting.